



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/997,056	11/29/2001	Ronnie Ira Chaiken	50037.71US01	4833
<div>27488 7590 08/28/2007 MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT) P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903</div>				
			EXAMINER DAO, THUY CHAN	
			ART UNIT 2192	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/28/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/997,056	CHAIKEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thuy Dao	2192	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mr. Grace (Reg. No. 52,956). (3) _____

(2) Thuy Dao. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 21 August 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Morshed et al. (US Patent No. 6,760,903).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Grace briefly described the claimed invention and the distinction between the claimed limitations over the cited prior art.

The examiner explained his position in the rejection, which is based on the disclosures in the specification, especially in page 2, lines 3-28, and how the extracted portions from the cited reference could read on the claimed limitations.

It was agreed that the Applicants will file official reply/responses and the examiner will carefully consider said reply/responses accordingly.



TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Merchant & Gould

An Intellectual Property Law Firm

Merchant & Gould P.C.
701 Fifth Avenue
Suite 4100
Seattle, WA 98104-7097

A Professional Corporation

Fax Transmission | August 10, 2007

TO:

Attn: Examiner Thuy Chan Dao
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

FROM: Ryan T. Grace

OUR REF: 50037.71US01

Total pages, including cover letter: 4

PTO FAX NUMBER 1-571-273-8570

If you do NOT receive all of the pages, please telephone us at 206.342.6200, or fax us at 206.342.6201.

Title of Document Transmitted: Applicant Initiated Interview Request FormApplicant: Ronnie Ira Chaiken et al.Serial No.: 09/997,056Filed: November 29, 2001Group Art Unit: 2192Our Ref. No. 50037.71US01Confirmation No. 4833

By:

Name: Ryan T. GraceReg. No.: 52,956

I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted by facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Tracy Gutscher

Signature

Date

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 09/997,056

First Named Applicant: Chaiken

Examiner: Dao

Art Unit: 2192

Status of Application: Pending

Tentative Participants:

(1) Examiner Dao

(2) Examiner Dam

(3) Ryan Grace

(4)

Proposed Date of Interview: August 21

Proposed Time: 11am

I will Call Examiner Dao's phone number at proposed time. If you will be somewhere else please call 402-212-7510. You will not be able to reach me with any other number associated with the file.

Type of Interview Requested:(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video ConferenceExhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, provide brief description:

Issues To Be Discussed

(1) State of the Office Action and the 102 Rejection.

To reject a single independent claim, the Office Action relies on 21 different and disjoint portions of a 121 page patent. These 21 different portions span 20 columns of text and reference over 22 figures. For example, in attempting to show the teaching of independent claim 1, the Office Action fragments the *Morshed* reference and attempts to piece together unrelated idea fragments to attempt representing the combination of features set forth in claim 1. **To reject claim 1**, the Office Action cites, in order, the following 21 portions of *Morshed*, without further explanation:

1. Figure 3
2. col. 6, line 49 – col. 7, line 19.
3. col. 7, lines 46-63
4. Figure 14
5. col. 22, lines 19-40
6. Figure 4
7. col. 21, line 18-41

8. col. 13, line 44-54
9. col. 14, line 35-43.
10. Figure 6
11. col. 9, line 14 – col. 10, line 61
12. col. 7, line 46-col. 8, line 48
13. Figure 4
14. col. 7, lines 20-62
15. col. 25, line 57-67
16. col. 27, line 7-16
17. col. 27, line 51-col. 8 line 6
18. Figure 14
19. col. 22, line 19 – col. 23, line 29
20. Figure 3
21. col. 6, line 19 – col. 7, line 19

Not only is the above fragments incomprehensible to piece together, but there is absolutely no discussion in the Office Action as to how they may be pieced together or what feature is being taught by the cited portion. As an example, claim 1 pertains to "stack unwinding" The reference does not even remotely pertain to stack unwinding, let alone even mention a single time throughout the 121 pages of disclosure the terms "unwind," "unwind data", "unwind information block", or "unwind rewriter." A few portions of the Office Action recite "IR." Even though applicants cannot tell from the Office Action, Applicants are guessing that the IR is somehow being analogized to the unwind rewriter. Such an analogy would be unfounded considering that the reference specifically states that the IR is an intermediate representation that is instrumented to provide the object code. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the state of the Office Action and the teachings of the reference. Applicants contentions are more fully set forth below.

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-14, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,760,903 issued to Morshed (hereinafter "Morshed"). Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection. Independent claim 1 includes the following features that are not taught or otherwise suggested by the cited reference:

a plurality of procedures, wherein each procedure comprises a sequence of binary instructions;

a runtime for generating unwind data, wherein the unwind data includes a first plurality of blocks of metadata having a first order of blocks, wherein each block of metadata is associated with a corresponding procedure in the plurality of procedures, wherein each block of metadata in the plurality of blocks of metadata includes at least one unwind table and at least one unwind information block; and

an unwind rewriter programmed to obtain the unwind data and reorder the first plurality of blocks of metadata to generate a second plurality of blocks of metadata having a second order, wherein the unwind rewriter reorders the first plurality of blocks in accordance with a second unwind table and a second unwind information block, wherein the first plurality of blocks are reordered in response to a modification of the sequence of binary instructions within a procedure, such that the second plurality of blocks of metadata accurately represents the same runtime semantics as that of the unmodified sequence of binary instructions.

Morshed pertains to gathering information associated with a distributed application. *See Morshed*, at Abstract. The intermediate representation described in Morshed pertains to a typical intermediate representation during compilation of code. *Morshed*, at col. 7, lines 49-57. The intermediate representation data is instrumented to provide object code. *Morshed*, at col. 7, lines 1-5. Morshed does not even remotely pertain to stack unwinding or rewriting unwind data. Nowhere in the 121 page reference does Morshed even mention "unwind," "unwind data", "unwind information block", "unwind rewriter," let alone the features that are associated with these terms. Applicants can find no teaching of processing unwind data in Morshed. Morshed does not teach "wherein each block of metadata in the plurality of blocks of metadata includes at least one unwind table and at least one unwind information block." Accordingly, Morshed cannot possibly teach "an unwind rewriter programmed to obtain the unwind data and reorder the first plurality of blocks of metadata to generate a second plurality of blocks of metadata having a second order, wherein the unwind rewriter reorders the first plurality of blocks in accordance with a second unwind table and a second unwind information block." Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.


Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Examiner/SPE Signature

Ryan T. Grace
Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

52,956
Registration Number, if applicable